ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNAL USE ONLY

Office of the Inspector General's

Headquarters Interview Program

1974

STAT

Officer -

Typist -

Completion of Report - December 31, 1974

Completion of Typing - June 1975

Distribution:
1 - DCI
1 - OMS
1 - D/Personnel
1 - IG
1 - IG
1 - IG

Interviews done by staff members:

STAT

ADMINISTRATIVE INTERNAL USE ONLY

— Headquarters Interview Program —
1974

Record Center
Job No. 1

Box 76-54-3

HEADQUARTERS INTERVIEW PROGRAM

Introduction

1. The Office of the Inspector General conducted a program of interviewing headquarters employees during the summer and fall of 1974. It was decided to take as the persons to be interviewed those professional employees at headquarters who were in their fifth and tenth years with the Agency. Past records indicated that there is a slight increase in resignations in those periods, and the thought was that there may be a sharper focus on the part of those interviewed concerning the Agency and their place in it. We interviewed 276 persons. With the advice of personnel in the Office of Medical Services a questionnaire was designed to provide both a structured format for purposes of statistical manipulation and a number of open-ended questions designed to elicit some of the more general attitudes and reasoning of employees as a basis for looking behind the relatively sterile information often produced by such questionnaires. Rather than being left to their own devices, to resolve definitional questions by themselves in filling out the questionnaires, each employee was interviewed. Thus, this report presents both statistical results and more general conclusions and evaluations. Some of the highlights

of the results, and our observations concerning them, are presented in this section of the report.

2. A substantial majority of those interviewed see the Agency as a good place to work, and project a satisfying career for themselves here. This generally favorable reaction is modified, however, by some critical qualifications about the Agency's performance in several areas and by a latent unease about the future of career prospects. It may also need modifying in view of expressions about intent to remain with the Agency. While only 2% of the survey population say they intend to leave, in contrast to the actual annual rate of departure of 1%, 16% say they are uncertain; some 12% either evaluate their prospects for a satisfying career in the Agency as slight, or feel unable to make a judgment.

3. Some general observations can be made on other than statistical compilations, being based on the cumulative results of individually expressed attitudes toward issues presented throughout the questionnaire. They emerge also from common elements underlying specific responses to different questions.

4. One overall impression from this survey group is that its members are attracted to the Agency basically by the dynamic work situation. The more specific reasons are the substance of the work

- 2 -

itself, the vitality of the work environment, and personal recognition

in the job, all of which gives rise to job satisfaction.

　　　5.　The sense of job satisfaction is a strong built-in asset of

the Agency, however perishable it may be.　We have no direct evidence

that this is deteriorating, but scattered comments on Agency performance

and concern over the future of some Agency functions suggest that the

condition of this resource should be to continue to receive the

conscious attention of management.　The durability of job satisfaction

varies with its cause and, according to attitudes expressed in this

survey, relates to the actions of different echelons of management

experienced by the individual employee.　In many fields -- economics

and engineering to mention only two -- job satisfaction is attached,

for example, to the state of the art practiced in the Agency.

Maintenance of the equipment, personnel and objectives which account

for this advanced level of endeavor, depend upon the decisions of high

level management echelons.　Quite different management groups are

associated with the conditions needed to make administrative and

support positions and lower level jobs hold the employees' interest.

The management capability involved in all of this spans from critical

policy makers to co-working supervisors.　The importance of manage-

ment-supervisory expertise at every level of the Agency is nowhere

else so clear, we believe, as in a composite picture of its direct

impact upon individual job satisfaction.

6. By stressing the strength and importance of job satisfaction, we do not mean to say that job status, i.e., grade level and advancement, are not important or that they are considered to be completely satisfactory by all. We do mean, however, that unless serious inequities are felt, personnel status is not an exclusive consideration in assessments of the Agency by employees. Even the personnel-oriented nature of the Agency, commented upon favorably by many, means personal recognition as a contributing member of an office is important as often as it means being looked after in personal welfare terms.

7. A second general observation is that the existing opportunity for individuals to make their own impact is very important. Along with job satisfaction as discussed above, this opportunity appears largely to explain the apparently firm commitment of personnel to the Agency. It is the adverse of overly bureaucratic processes. Some interviewees, in fact, expressed their admiration for the Agency by contrasting it to most other Government Agencies which they describe as too rigid to use, or to permit scope for, the development of individual capabilities.

8. The scope for individual initiative is stated directly as a good thing. It is in comparative situations, however, where the

desire for individual input is most apparent, e. g. a lower level of
bureaucratic performance is accepted because it assures a wider
scope for individual action. Supervision, for example, is noted as
much for its absence as its performance; general direction and
delegation of responsibility is judged by many to be a positive feature.
The absence of oppressive office direction is welcomed, and the
function rated rather well, in exchange simply for a first-among-
equals working chief. The loose structure of this working relationship
is clearly desired by many.

9. In a different area, the various organized or unorganized
systems for discussing careers with subordinates is a case in point.
Despite the different levels and substance of such discussions through-
out the Agency, the majority of our sample population say they are
satisfactory. The principal reason is that they are responsive to
questions and oriented generally with regard to career expectations
and possible directions for career development. To a great extent
employees believe that a more formally organized system for career
development is not really possible. They are, consequently, more
or less content to live with the loose system that provides for
discussing their own situation, and which also permits using their own
initiative and keeping their options open. This does not mean there are
not those who decry the limitations of the present situation and feel

that the direction of careers should be better organized in the Agency;

or that even the informal system now in use could not perform better.

It does mean that a good many, on balance, feel the actual system works

fairly well and prefer to initiate and maneuver there own way within it.

10. The response to one question throws an interesting sidelight

on the way more or less closed formal organizations are perceived with

respect to individual career movement. Directorates have long been

considered by many to be almost impenetratable by personnel from

other directorates. And yet more than 50% of our sample population

feel that it is either possible, or very possible, to move careers across

Directorate lines. Only 4% view it as impossible and the rest as seldom

possible, i.e. resting upon unique conditions.

11. In these remarks about the attitude of employees favoring

their ability to move as individuals within one system, we do not mean

that all those interviewed feel similarly about imperfections in the

performance of organizational entities or systems. Critical

evaluations are made in each area of activity covered in this survey.

Nor do we mean to say that good ratings on functions are not qualified,

occasionally even to the extent of negating the evaluation. There is

ambivalence, for example, in the desire to pick one's career from

point to point, and to have more security in a better organized system.

Ambivalence for the individual is matched by the choice faced by

management in general, particularly in balancing formal procedure

against unstructured practice, to assure timely achievement of

objectives while leaving sufficient room for the full play of

individual talents. In balance, the attitudes expressed in this survey

seem to favor the fact that management leans toward relying upon

individual initiative in less formally structured systems. As well

disposed as employees are towards this general approach, a number

feel there is room for better organization. When asked at the end of

the interview for any comment they wished to make, 125 responded.

The largest bloc (38, or 30%) said that better management is needed

in the Agency. We do not feel that this negates our overall evaluation,

but that it is a lesser part of the ambivalence that might be expected

towards such a subject.

12. A third general observation is that there is a latent

uneasiness about the future. The threshold at which it might become

manifest is uncertain, a result, we believe, of problems of the past

couple of years. The unease is evidenced in employees' listing of

current concerns, namely, the handling of possible RIFs, downgrading,

reorganization, and public problems. We have made no attempt to

assess the unease implicit in some attitudes about regular functions

such as promotions, assignments and career advancement. We do

believe, however, that there is increasing sensitivity to methods of ranking personnel and to rating the importance of work in functions and offices.

13. The uneasiness has overtones of insecurity, both personal and organizational, best seen in remarks made supplementary to discussions on a variety of specific areas. In each instance the implicit question is about the effect of management's action or inaction upon individual security, i.e., the employee's job, function or grade. The concern may range to the policy level, where a question is raised as to whether the Agency is asserting its role on the national level against competitors in the production of intelligence; the loss of proper Agency functions is a concern. At a lower level, a component's leadership is questioned for not ensuring the regular flow of information necessary for the office to produce on a level commensurate with an office doing related work; downgrading of the office's function is the concern. In another viewpoint, while the announced objectives of an office are said to be achieved fully, the ultimate objective to which the office contributes is said to be off target and to make little or no contribution to national security. The concern is that the individual will suffer along with the office in the long run, as having a capability of little worth. The same concern is expressed in another dimension

in relation to a question on the mental alertness of an office. Some

officers who rated theirs at the highest level went on to observe that

this was the case in spite of a personnel policy which failed to handle

older officers who could not grasp new techniques, principles and

theories, and who attempted to impose less dynamic approaches on

the work. Their concern is with the obstacle this poses to the real

contribution they feel they can make in their field and the consequences

upon their job and grade.

I

Personnel Management

1. This section describes Agency performance in several areas of personnel management as viewed by our survey sample. Table 1 below shows the percentages of favorable and unfavorable reactions in these areas, which will be discussed in turn.

Table 1

Effectiveness of Personnel Management
by Percentages of Grades

| Action Area | Grades | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Good | Moderate | Poor |
| Abilities, use of | 36% | 49% | 14% |
| Advancement, rapidity of | 64% (Yes) | 7% (Unsure) | 29% (Poor) |
| Promotion System, reliability of | 19% | 56% | 22% (3% not applicable) |
| Reassignments, adequacy of methods used | 16% | 38% | 32% (14% not applicable) |
| Reassignments, opportunity to seek other jobs | 83% (Yes) | | 17% (no) |
| Reassignments, possibility of Transfers to other Directorates | 11% | 46% | 43% |
| Career development, consideration of | 81% (satisfactory) | | 13% (not satisfactory) |

2. In balance, personnel management functions as shown in Table 1, are felt to be performed reasonably well. The criticisms made by the personel interviewed, however, deserves attention and some comment. Negative responses in four of the seven areas shown in the Table are 20% or above, a level at which researchers feel the attitude becomes significant. Qualifications attached to some affirmative answers further indicate the need for attention. For example, while only 17% say it is not really possible to seek new jobs on one's own initiative, more positive answers are sometimes pretty well hedged as to the opportunity or advisability of doing so. Similarly, to the extent that mobility is considered desirable, 32% say the process is poor; the 14% recorded as "not applicable" here saying reassignments do not occur in their work.

3. Favorable responses are on the more moderate side in every area, except the two where only a positive or negative answer is possible. This balance toward the more average rating is also heavy, about two-fold, with the exception being the use of ability where only about a third rate it better than average; however, 85% say that their abilities are being used either fully or generally. One factor modifies the generally favorable reaction. This is the time element. While 64% feel they have advanced as rapidly as the should, 75% feel that the promotion system works either well or reasonably well.

4.   The first area cited in Table 1, the extent to which an individual's abilities are being used, needs no further comment here beyond the evaluations as presented.   The second area, the adequacy of personal advancement, can be elaborated and some perspective can be provided.   (See Table 3 in the Appendix for the actual advancement rates of the survey group. )

5.   In terms of the actual number of promotions, 64% of the group feel that they have fared very well; the 29% who have fared poorly in their own judgments may have valid questions.   Our review of the survey answers indicates that nearly 2/3 have not been in grade for an undue time, with another 20% having been in grade for two to four years and 12% for four years or more.   We cannot evaluate the validity of employees' views of their own progress, and note it here as a factor in their overall attitudes.

6.   In an internal breakdown of the sample population with respect to advancement, eight percent more among the nine year group feel advancement has not been as good as the younger group.   This figure is more interesting than significant especially since much of it is balanced by the response "uncertain" in the younger group.   The differences among the Directorates, however, are somewhat greater. Interviewees from the DDO are less often satisfied than the average for

the population (14% fewer) while the DDI and DDA have more who

are satisfied, 8% and 11% respectively. These differences are

explained, at least in part, by the actual distribution of grades and

length of service within Directorates. The DDO has 30% more of

those of its personnel interviewed are in the lowest grades, with 30%

less in the highest grades, while the DDA and DDI people that we

interviewed have more favorable balances in both ends of the

distribution. It is emphasized that these are the figures for those

interviewed and are not offered as representing the grade distributions

of the full population. Beyond these facts, which may be related to

differences in attitudes about advancement, a few interviewees gave

unique reactions. Some who entered with high grades have been

satisfied with whatever promotion they may have had, including

none, and a few at more or less modest grades feel they have done very

well, in terms of their own capabilities. More extreme, a few officers

of substantial grade who came to the Agency from private business feel

that advancement is too rapid and without justification in some cases.

They attribute this to a misguided policy of almost automatic

promotion, especially in the lower professional grades.

7. Among those who feel they have not advanced rapidly enough

(29% of the total) more than half attribute the problem to management

actions affecting personnel in general. These actions include one-step

promotions (which are contrasted with two-step promotions up to

GS-11 in other Government Agencies), RIFs and grade freezes, uneven

distribution of openings and qualifying personnel among Directorates

and components, lack of head room, and time-in-grade requirements.

These complaints against management overshadow those made about

the handling of the promotion system, i.e. evaluating performance to

determine who is to be promoted. In this latter respect, adverse

explanations include the failure of responsible officers to recognize

the quality of performance per se, the bias being in favor of those

working on crisis areas or handling the more dramatic accounts, and

personal discrimination. In addition, a few say they have never

recovered the ground lost in an original mis-assignment. Some say

they have not been given the opportunity to supervise or take the

training necessary to advance.

     8. Training offered by the Agency was considered favorably over-

all. Good courses are available, and those taken are most often

related to jobs. Where fault is found with training (by some 11%), it

is most generally attributed to administrative difficulties such as

scheduling difficulties, inability of offices to release the employee,

or some breakdown in the process of enrollment. A broader

observation, however, is that courses of study are not ear-marked to

fit any progression toward future goals. Several interviewees also comment that things are done in reverse, namely that certain courses are established to provide capabilities needed by the Agency (e. g. management) and that quotas are then placed upon components which simply fill them as a matter of requirement. They believe, rather, that qualified officers should be selected and groomed to fill certain types of positions, and courses run to fit the resulting demand.

9. With regard to the promotion system, there is a slight direct correlation between more favorable evaluations and the size of the current grade, the greater the number of promotions, the older the age, and the male sex. There is no pattern with respect to time in grade. This is not to say that these are causative factors, but only that they are reflected in the way the population divides on its attitude toward the promotion system.

10. Three quarters of those who grade the promotion system say it functions well or reasonably well. In discussing the system, however, the adverse comments from this group, combined with the 22% who both grade and comment adversely, drop the unqualified positive response to about 50%. The qualifications are made largely by those who grade the system as working "reasonably well" as opposed to "well". (See Table 5 in the Appendix. )

11. In explaining their reaction to the promotion system, just under half (45%) commend it, mainly because it is a fair system in which merit is rewarded or because their personal experience with promotions has been good. The rest (55%) are critical, primarily because they feel that promotions are made arbitrarily. (See Tabulation on Master Questionnaire) Arbitrary action is attributed largely to human weaknesses, e.g., personal contacts and decisions play too large a part, or some types of work attract undue attention and rewards. Much, however, is laid at the door of management for failing to establish precise criteria less immune to individual interpretation, or for questionable policy which provides almost automatic promotions in the lower grades or gives undue weight to seniority and time-in-grade. A second criticism made by some 15% is that more needs to be known about the system, either because they feel there is no real system and individuals propel the activity, or that it is not adequately explained or understood.

12. Fifty-four percent feel that the reassignment process works reasonably well, or better. Many who grade the system favorably nevertheless make critical remarks about the way it is conducted; together, with the group who both rate and comment adversely, these combine to reduce the unqualified positive response to something between one-third and one-quarter of the population. In addition,

14% say that reassignment is not applicable to their jobs or in their offices, where few have ever been known to move out. (See Table 6 in Appendix for cross-index of grades and graded comments.)

13. 32% of those who discussed the reassignment system said there is a good balance between the needs of management and the preferences of individuals, and that efforts are made to accommodate the two in consultation with individual officers concerned. The views of those who feel that management dominates the process are modified by the fact that the handling of reassignments is correspondingly graded "reasonably good" in a few more cases than "not very well." That is to say while 18% feel that management's requirements dominate personal preferences, some feel that their career has not been hurt even though they have not been consulted about their assignments. Even among those who believe that the individual must initiate and even maneuver himself into desired assignments (11%), a number feel this is the preferred situation. The largest group (39%) who say there is no system and no perceivable pattern in the way reassignments are made, however, seems clearly to mean this to be an adverse comment. They say that reassignments, and thus advancement of careers, depend upon who you know, and are random chance at that; or that employees are stuck in some components or occupations who do not wish to be; or that there is no career planning with respect to the sequence of

assignments. Even established rotation slots can be risky, they

say, because the parent component makes no preparation to reabsorb

officers on return.

14. Three questions in the interview are related to the processes

of reassignment. When asked whether they could initiate action to find

other jobs, for example, 83% said they had. Many of these qualified

their statement by saying one had to know how to go about it without

antagonizing his office and that, to be successful, you should be sure

to set up the new job firmly before opening the issue. Some based their

affirmative response on the hope placed in the new job notice system while

also noting many real difficulties with it, such as receiving notices too

late for action, learning that jobs had been filled from within an office,

and running into administrative obstacles in trying to follow up on such

notices. The nature of many of these remarks lead us to believe that

individual initiative is still very important and alive, at least in the

minds of men.

15. In a second area related to reassignments namely the

opportunity to cross Directorate boundaries, over half (57%) feel

it is possible, while the balance of those answering feel it is only

seldom possible or not at all. By and large, there is a strong attach-

ment to the component, and Directorate, in which people do their

actual work. This attachment is demonstrated in the answers to another

question, in which 91% of those answering said they considered their office and Directorate to be better than or equal to others known to them. The fact that 32% of the sample population failed to give an answer is explained, we believe, by lack of information about other Directorates and not any reluctance to express an adverse opinion.

16. The last area of personnel management activities, the consideration of career futures with officers, is difficult to characterize because it has many facets. Experience among our sample population varies substantially in the substance and level at which the discussions are held, as well as in the reality of their situations and their own expectations. It is a formal, comprehensive process in some components, but more generally it is informal and related to only one or another aspect of a career. While those questioned might say they had discussed their future career, as three-fourths did, a simple majority talked with their supervisor and the rest spread their contacts among a more senior officer, a component's career officer, and a personnel officer. Many (43%) initiated the discussion, while it came about for others, in order of percentages, in routine reassignment questionnaires of varying character, in conjunction with the Fitness Report, by a personnel officer or even by random opportunity. The subject or subjects discussed varied accordingly, ranging across overall discussions (56%) which varied widely in substance and

practicality, possible assignments, down simply to evaluations
of performance.

17. Despite the several dimensions touched upon above, a few
relevant observations can be made about the processes for handling
this loosely assigned function. First, we interject the note that
satisfaction with these discussions seems to decline with longevity;
about 8% fewer of the nine-year group are satisfied than in the four-
year group. Among Directorates, the sample from the DDO is more
satisfied than the others, 5% more are satisfied and fewer are dis-
satisfied than the average. With regard to the overall assessments
of the total population, 81% say the discussion was satisfactory and
of this the majority (58%) attribute the cause to responsive and
encouraging exchanges. Opportunities had been suggested, they say, and
capabilities had been frankly discussed and questions answered. Another
group (11%), somewhat in the same vein, say that the discussion was
good, within the limits of the possible. This pretty much depicts the
situation, that is, for the most part the maximum function in the field
is to clarify opportunities and hopes with respect to more or less
specific career tracks, and to recognize that advancement toward
them is a joint endeavor for which the individual is also responsible.
One group of 14%, however, say that the discussion was good because

they did get concrete results, namely, what they wanted by way of

an assignment, substantial training or the like. We believe that this

sample population either recognizes or is resigned to the present

situation, this being demonstrated by the small percentage (11%) of

critical remarks.

18. We pursued the subject of career discussions with the group

of 66 who had not talked about their future with any officer. Their

answers, in contrast to those above, which concentrated more on

general understandings about possibilities, while recognizing the

limits of practical results, were almost all in terms of practical

consequences. About half felt that the informal system of determining

careers worked all right, that they could manage by themselves, and

that no purpose was to be served by formal discussions. The other

half largely felt that it would be useless to discuss their careers

because of obstacles in the "system" or management officers. Only

a few expanded the dimension of the subject to say that any formal

discussion of careers would be relatively without purpose until

a policy of career development had been enunciated and put into

practice throughout the Agency.

19. One further remark can be made about career development.

At the end of the interview we asked if there were any comment they

wished to make and 125 interviewees responded. One-fourth of these

say that they believed there should be more opportunity to develop

a career.

II


## Supervisory Management


1.  We asked for evaluations and sometimes comments in

several areas of management's use of manpower.   The questions

ranged from the more personalized, i. e. the extent to which the

employee's abilities are used in an office, to ones of less direct

personal involvement, i. e. the way functions of the office are

organized with respect to overall objectives.   The Table below

presents the distribution of grades given these largely supervisory

functions, which will be discussed in turn.

Table 2

Effectiveness of Supervision in the
Use of Manpower

by percentage of grades given[1]

| Supervisory Function | Grade | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Good | Moderate | Poor |
| Use of abilities of subordinates | 36% | 49% | 14% |
| Supervision of work of subordinates | 71% | 17% | 8% |
| Communication of Information needed to perform job | 63% | 27% | 7% |
| Letter of Instruction | 10% | 20% | 48% [22% not applicable] |
| Division of work and responsibility within the office | 39% | 49% | 9% |
| Organization of the office with respect to its objectives | 35% | 49% | 11% |

(1) The percentages do not total 100% in the rows because interviewees sometimes feel the question does not apply to their situation.

2. About half of those interviewed believe that their abilities
are used moderately well in their current jobs, with a little over a
third feeling they are used fully. This is a very favorable reaction,
we believe, because many who make the more moderate evaluation
recognize they are performing more modest tasks often while
learning the dimensions of particular functions.

3. The small group of 38 who believe their abilities are under-
used attribute the problem to three general causes, one of which is
poor supervision. Most say that the jobs they hold do not require
their level of abilities, and the remainder that the job is too
narrowly designed to permit some supervisory experience, which
they want and for which they feel qualified. Comments were requested
only on negative evaluations and are too few to do more than call
attention to them. In the first case abilities are said to be underused
because the chief, who has been promoted from the ranks more often then
not, takes the best accounts for himself and leaves more than one good
officer with either very lean or drab pickings. This type of problem
belongs to the next level of management. The feeling that the job
does not make a full claim on abilities includes cases of assigning
over-qualified people to lesser jobs, as well as over-stating the
requirements actually needed. A separate question was asked about

job requirements and drew a negative response from 14% of those

interviewed to the effect that they were not appropriate to the actual

work. Many who do not know what the formal requirements are, feel

that their job fits them pretty well; however, some feel that they have

higher degrees which are not needed. Others say that they have

succeeded with only high school educations but that new requirements

had or were being placed on their jobs, to wit, higher degrees. They

feel that this is one more move to reduce the opportunity for people to

advance in the Agency on the basis of ability and hard work; that it is

discriminatory; that it is part of a trend toward bureaucracy.

4. The role of supervisor per se (the second item on Table 2)

is rated overall as the best performed among the functions of supervision,

followed closely by a directly related function, the communication of

information needed to carry out assigned work. The supervisor is

given more good grades and fewer poor grades by a wide margin over

the other functions. Some 70% of the interviewees pronounce the

supervision they receive to be good, and a majority of the remainder

say it is "fair". The explanations accompanying the grades give rise

to two generalizations. First, evaluations of "good" are not just for

positive acts in the eyes of subordinates, but the absence of undue

restrictions over their own work, -- generally, therefore, for the

absence of close supervision. Second, the less favorable

explanations, which are linked heavily to supervision regarded as

"fair" as well as "poor", do not charge individual supervisors so

much as the management which put them there.

5. Nine year veterans tend to be a little less generous in their

grading of supervision than their colleagues of four years, with a

spread of 10% between their ratings. Among the Directorates,

Administration personnel score their supervisors down, in contrast

to Operations personnel, who award a higher grade to their supervisors.

The other two Directorates are close to the average figure for the

population, Intelligence being more generous by 5% and S&T less by

the same amount.

6. What is wanted and what is expected of supervision, of course,

vary with individuals and their status. But answers have one factor

in common and to this extent reflect a smaller range of differences

then the figures otherwise imply. This common factor is the hope of

being allowed to exert their full abilities on their own initiative as

far as possible. (See Table 3 in the Appendix for a ranking of

supervision, by comments). For example, those who feel that

supervision is "good" give three major reasons for their opinion, two

of which are given also by some who grade it "fair". The largest group

feel that the office situation fosters rapport and team effort among

colleagues to produce positive results. The supervisor may or may

not be much involved, but if he does not actively promote interaction,

he is available and there is mutual respect. The second explanation,

in terms of the number of personnel giving it, is that supervisors

treat their subordinates as professionals who know their job, are

expected to do it, and are given considerable latitude in carrying

it out; this explanation is elaborated by some to say that the assign-

ment is clearly established and assistance is available if the

subordinate feels the need. The third major reason is that the

supervisor is well qualified and respected in his substantive field.

This usually means that he is a leader in his field whose counsel or

criticism on work is productive; he is a man to be followed and

listened to in this respect. Whether he exerts any "supervisory"

action, is consequently considered secondary.

7. With regard to differences in grading supervision, there is

little between nine and four year personnel, but the DDO attributes

11% more of its favorable comments than the average to officers who

are respected in their field, and 4% more to effective working relations

in an office. This is balanced in the DDO by 10% fewer critical

comments than the average, while the DDS&T make 9% more. The

reasons given for evaluations of "poor", which amount to 8% (or 25%

when the grade of fair is added) are that supervision is inconsistent

and not reliable, or that the supervisor is untrained or simply poor

at the task. A few feel that the immediate supervisor's function

has been wiped out by the strength of a higher echelon, or

contrariwise, that so many administrative tasks have been placed on

the supervisor that he cannot oversee the operations of his office.

8. We have long heard the attitude expressed that strong

substantive officers are pushed into supervisory-management

positions for which they are not qualified. While this attitude might

be confirmed by some in our sample, we are impressed by the fact

that 71% feel that supervision is good -- not fair (another 17%).

Further, different attributes are credited for good supervision

including, solely, leadership in a substantive field. Whether these

different attributes -- i.e., excellence in a field, responsiveness,

and free rein, correlate with particular types of jobs, offices, or

people, we cannot say, but we believe they are interchangeable to a

large extent. If this is the case, the Agency's overall supervisory

talent is better than hearsay would have one believe.

9. At the same time we do not mean to ignore the 25% who are

critical of supervision in one respect or another (17% fair, 8% poor).

This is too large a group to be complacent about. But we are struck with

the fact, more often implicit then explicit, that our interviewees tend

to fault higher management for what is wrong, rather than immediate

office supervisors with whom they appear to sympathize if not identify.

The explanatory phrases in critical remarks about supervisors use

only slightly different words, namely that men are forced into such

positions; they are not given training; they are not prepared; they cannot

handle two jobs simultaneously. One interviewee, a supervisor himself,

came to the interview with a rack-up of administrative papers he had

handled in a three month period and left him no time, properly speaking,

to supervise the operations of his office.

10. The flow of information needed by officers to do their assigned

work, a function related to supervision, is evaluated about the same

as supervision in general, although interviewees tend to grade it a little

more in the moderate range. Poor communication is attributed by

almost all of a small group, 8% of the total, to the fact that management

filters out much information as it passes down the channel of staff

meetings, or that the interpretation of what is passed down becomes so

watered as to be relatively without substance.

11. The Letter of Instruction (LOI) has yet to prove itself to our

personnel as an instrument for supervision. Slightly over half of the

population believe it is impractical, or of help only in a few types of

positions or at the start of jobs; or they are unsure that it is useful

at all. Another substantial group (16%) is unable to give an opinion

largely because they didnot have an LOI when interviewed, or (6%)

is unsure since experience with the LOI is limited.  In explaining why

it is impractical, even though they feel the concept may have sounded

good, interviewees say it merely duplicates the Fitness Report or the

job description; or, it is stereotyped almost from the beginning and

lacks the unique dynamic aspect expected; or, it is unnecessary since

there is good communication with the supervisor.  In support of the

importance of good communication as a normal supervisory function,

some feel the LOI is a good instrument because it requires direct

discussions with the supervisor which they have not had.  In general

terms, many view the LOI with amusement, or even cynicism, as a

bureaucratic exercise and treat it as such.  The first reaction of a

great many of the question was a quizical smile and a shrug.

12.  Those who view the LOI favorably, about a third of the survey

population, give a range of positive explanations which pretty much

coincide with its purposes i. e. , it is effective in setting tasks,

responsibilities and goals; it is a useful management tool in stimulating

communication between supervisor and subordinate; and, it sets firm

responsibilities for subordinates against which they know their

performance will be judged.  Some, but not many, say that the LOI

includes some planning ahead for their own development.

30

13. A large part of this sample population look upon the LOI as an instrument imposed by management and variously handled by supervisors. The criticism or blame is directed more at management than at individual supervisors.

14. If the LOI is to become more successful, it will have to be taken more seriously by a good many officers; it will have to be initiated by the supervisor rather than being a product of the subordinate; it will have to do more than duplicate other management instruments; it will have to contain something dynamic for positions which do not themselves change much over time; and it will have to be demonstrated to some that it is not an instrument designed by management to support charges of inadequate performance.

15. The two remaining major supervisory management functions, namely the way in which work and responsibility are delineated in an office, and the way it is organized overall to meet its objectives, are evaluated by most as either well (39%) or reasonably well (49%) performed, with the balance toward the more moderate grade. Only some 9% believe that either of these functions is poorly handled. When the evaluations given by interviewees to the two functions are cross indexed, about one-third rate them differently, usually but not always by one grade difference, i. e., good on one and moderate on the other. [See Table 4 in the Appendix for a cross index of these evaluations.]

31

16. Interviewees were also asked whether they felt they had any opportunity to influence the way their office is organized. There is an even division of 47% who feel they have a moderate or better chance (heavily weighted to the latter) and 47% who think they have little or none (about equally divided). There are no hard facts to interpret this response, i.e., we do not know to what extent this group could in fact expect to influence an office's organization. We do know, however, that half of the sample is in GS-11 or lower and that almost two-thirds have been with the Agency not more than five years. We also know that 80% to 85% believe the requirements for their jobs are appropriate, and that their abilities are being reasonably well used at this time. Given these facts and attitudes, the feeling of so many that there is an opportunity to influence an office, seems to indicate a healthy identification with an office. This reaction seems to share a common base with that expressed on supervision, namely the belief or hope that the individual can make a personal impact upon the work of this Agency.

17. One further question was asked with respect to the effective use of manpower, this one with respect to the extent to which the office is achieving its objectives. The combined evaluations of good and moderate is 95% -- higher than that for any of the supervisory

functions treated here. The 49% "good" ratings is also greater than the

proportion of this rating for how responsibility is divided in the office

(39%) or how it is organized (35%). Further with respect to this higher

evaluation of achievement, the nine year group gives a higher rating of

good than the four year group, with a spread of 10% between them.

18. There are no hard facts to explain why the evaluation of the

achievement of objectives is higher than that accorded the performance

of supervisory functions, which might be considered directly related to

such production. The differences are interesting rather than significant.

Whereas a total of 106 interviewee's gave the same grades on each

separate question, 49 who say the division of responsibility is well

performed rate achievement as only reasonably good, while 65 say the

division of responsibility is only reasonably good but that achievement

is better.

19. Whether the slightly higher evaluation given to achievement is

significant or not, we believe that the overall favorable response rests

on a basic factor noted above, namely a high degree of identification with

the work of an office. This interpretation gains support in the response

to a question about the mental tone, that is the intellectual approach to

work in an office. Four choices were offered to this question on which

one third said the intellectual approach to work was vigorous and 46%

said alert. In both of these cases, some normal qualifications were made with respect to peaks and valleys and to smaller or larger sections of offices or components. A more striking qualification, however, was about older personnel. The charge was made that some had retired in place, while others were unable to adjust to more advanced techniques and approaches. Interviewees with these views felt that "management" should develop personnel policies to cope with this deadwood, freeing them and their colleagues from this anachronistic influence. From another viewpoint, some were willing to say that their offices were less than alert in their approach to work. Even when this admission was made, individuals largely dissociated themselves and attributed the cause to management difficulties, some of it to personnel, and finally to uninspiring work. The thread which seems present in responses to many questions is not only personal identification with an office or group, but with a real or wished for dynamic, productive work situation.

III

The Agency as a Place for a Career

1. We approached a general or net evaluation of the Agency from three angles. First, by asking for an assessment of the individual's future career potential, and intent to remain with the Agency. Second by inquiring into the reasons for the evaluation made of the Agency place to work. Last, by ascertaining the causes of the state of morale in the Agency as they felt it to be.

2. The meaning of evaluations is often subject to interpretation as to whether an evaluation is intended, for example, to be just average or above average. Notwithstanding this difficulty, we believe that some-where betwee 80% and 90% of this survey population believe that their careers and the Agency are substantial and attractive. While morale is an elusive quality and on occasion was depicted as being somewhat less sturdy, the causes attributed to this condition are not directly rleated to internal factors which strongly attract officers to the Agency, but more to external forces.

3. Most officers believe they can have a career in the Agency which is at least generally satisfying. A smaller percentage, however, say they intend to remain with the Agency, and some of these

qualify their intent as limited to the foreseeable future, -- perhaps

five years. Against 8% who do not anticipate a very satisfying career

here, 2% say they do not intend to remain and 16% (43) are uncertain.

We do not know all of the specific reasons for this uncertainty, but

they include a simple preference for living elsewhere, greater opportunity

for advancement elsewhere, and dissatisfaction with personnel status or

the Agency.

4. There is little difference about intent among the Directorates,

except for Administration where no officer says he intends to leave. There

is a spread of 13% between the four- and the nine-year groups. Fewer of

the four-year group intend to stay, the number of those who are uncertain

is substantially higher, and 3% intend to leave in contrast to the 1% for the

nine-year group.

5. The overall picture of intent suggests that a slightly larger

percentage might contemplate withdrawal than the number that has

separated annually over the past five years. In contrast, the fact that

commitment is firmer at nine years than at four may well suggest that the

percentage leaving will not be greater. No firm conclusion, however, can

be drawn from this data, nor is there any formula to estimate the relation

of intent to action.

6. The picture described above, correctly we believe, is strongly

positive. This is not to say there are not negative aspects of a magnitude

to attract attention. Nor is it to ignore the fact that a sizeable share

of the favorable response rests in the more average ratings and may

or may not have the vitality to survive some types of adversity.

These qualifying facets are noted as relevant in the discussion below.

7. Almost without exception, interviewees use only the highest

three grades of a five-point scale to evaluate the Agency as a place

to work, and rank it in order as very good, excellent, good. They

concentrate their reasons for their evaluations on one facet, namely,

dynamic work and working relations, as demonstrated in the following

table:

Table 7

Positive and Negative Attributes of the
Agency as a Place to Work

| Attributes ranked by % of interviewees citing each | Total % | Average Grade for the Agency by Rank of Attribute in each Grade | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1. Very Good | 2. Excellent | 3. Good |
| 1. Good administration provides job satisfaction | 31.4% | 1 (15.5%) | 2 (9.8%) | 1 (6.1%) |
| 2. Opportunity to pursue a professional career in depth | 27.3% | 2 (10.6%) | 1 (13.3%) | 3 (3.4%) |
| 3. High quality of personnel | 15.2% | 3 (7.2%) | 3 (6.8%) | 4 (1.5%) |
| 4. Importance of Agency mission and role | 12.5% | 4 (4.9%) | 4 (6.4%) | 5 (.8%) |
| 5. Poor personnel and management policy or treatment | 11% | 5 (2.7%) | --- | 2 (5.3%) |
| 6. Other | 2.7% | | | |

8. There is no clear correlation between the rank given for several features attributed to the Agency and the overall grade but there are some interesting comparisons. Good administration which promotes job satisfaction and opportunity to pursue a profession are ranked highest in each of the three grades, with a minor exception. Those who rate the Agency as only a good place to work, are critical of the opportunity to pursue a professional career, while those who feel the Agency is an excellent place, put particular stress upon this opportunity. The purported high quality of personnel scores a little ahead of the importance of the Agency mission and role.

9. Job satisfaction and good administration is wider in scope than the other categories and includes a small group who speak of job security and the personnel-oriented policies of this organization. For most, the reason is more directly related to the job, namely, an opportunity to advance in a career, -- e.g. responsibilities are given to individuals, and bureaucracy is not over-developed; and jobs are made stimulating through lateral movement, travel, recognition by supervisors, contact with a vareity of functions and interesting people, and by the mutual respect bestowed. Some thirty-two percent of the sample population feel that the Agency is a good place to work because of these factors, and they often contrast these to what they feel to be

38

the case in other government agencies, where things are more impersonal, inflexible, or structured.

10. The opportunity to pursue in depth the profession for which they had trained was cited as the attractive feature of the Agency by about a quarter of the sample population. Where else, they asked, could they find as good an outlet for the use of economic or political science or other professional capabilities; where else would the state of the art and the level of inquiry be so far in the forefront; or where would such independence and initiative be given the individual to pursue his work. These answers, and particularly the last, coincide to a great extent with those given to describe good supervision -- i. e. delegated responsibility and a free rein.

11. Those who commented voluntarily upon the possibility of a satisfying career ahead, often focused on the meaningfulness of their work, -- i. e. on the fact it was used, that it made a contribution. In citing the important role of the Agency as the reason for its being a good place to work, interviewees used much the same terms, -- worthwhile job, meaningful work, being used by someone who needs it. They would not work here, many said, if they did not feel their work was useful and that they were being productive.

12. The critical comments about the Agency made by 11% of the survey sample relate only to a limited extent to the dynamics of the work situation described above. The rather widely spread observations can be grouped roughly under criticism of personnel treatment and of management in general. With respect to the latter, they felt that resources are poorly used, that there is bureaucratic inertia, and that individuals are not given enough independence to make their full contribution. In most cases, the consequences of actions on the individual are the prime concern, namely, job insecurity, shabby or unfair personal treatment, slow promotions, inequitable assignments, and sex discrimination.

13. Explanations of the state of morale give some direct support to the assessment of the Agency as a good place to work. On one hand, a positive approach is taken where morale is rated as good or very good, and this is attributed most often to the attractive work situation as described above. On the other hand, where a negative approach is taken, it is more often where morale is felt to be only fair and the effort is to explain why it is not higher. These explanations cite the intrusion of external problems to a heavy extent.

14. Sixty percent of those who felt able to evaluate morale (20 people did not) said it was very good or good; the other 40% largely thought it was fair though a few placed it at poor.

40

15. Close to 100 people spoke of the Schlesinger period, and of current problems -- actual or threatened RIFs reorganizations and external problems such as Marchetti, as the primary factors affecting morale. Their appraisal of these factors however, do not always coincide with their overall evaluation of morale. Those who mentioned the problems of the Schlesinger period distributed their grades of good and fair, three to two; those who stressed current problems distributed their grades at about one to three, good to fair. In other words, while a majority feel that the Agency has recovered from the events of the Schlesinger period, more feel that current problems are now keeping morale down.

16. Internal weaknesses were cited by 40 to 50 people as the cause of what they viewed as lower morale. Some of these were attributed to management, e.g. the handling of current problems such as retirements and job reductions and the Marchetti case. In a special question on this case over 50% of those polled criticized the Agency's handling and the consequent damage to its reputation. While the remarks critical of internal performance were not always well formulated, others which touched upon management were with respect to bureaucratic burdens, inadequate management decisions, poor supervision, and the retention of no longer useful old timers. Problems with promotions, assignments, and job satisfaction were attributed to personnel practices.

17.  Some people who found it difficult to account for their

comparatively good feeling about the state of morale, attributed it in

general terms to the way people act, that is to their businesslike

attitude toward the job (no slacking off, getting to the job on time, no

horsing around), the absence of demoralizing talk in the corridors and

the cafeteria, and to the generally happy work atmosphere prevailing

at the time.  However, there is a latent unease with respect to job

security, which is reflected in part in the weight of fair and poor

assessments of morale -- i. e. 40%, which is a substantially larger

balance in this direction than evaluations of Agency performance.

This unease is related to the future of the Agency as affected largely

by external developments.

APPENDIX  A

Tables  3-9

Table 3

Evaluation of Supervision
by rank of the reason
within each grade

| Reason for Grade Ranked by percent Giving it | Grade Given Supervision Ranked | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1.  Good | 2.  Fair | 3.  Poor |
| 1. Effective working relations in the office | 1 (30%) | 2.3 (1.9%) | --- |
| 2. Free rein given to work | 2 (24%) | 2.3 (1.9%) | --- |
| 3. Supervisor is respected | 3 (16%) | --- | --- |
| 4. Supervision is inconsistent | --- | 1    (8%) | 1 (4.7%) |
| 5. Other | --- | 2.3 (1.9%) | 3 (2.3%) |
| 6. Supervisor is poor or untrained | --- | --- | 2 (1.5%) |
| ⌐Total   * | 190 (73%) | 44 (17.8%) | 22 (8.5%)⌐ |

* Percentages exceed the actual column totals because
not all of the grades are included, i.e. up only to rank 3.


NOTE: Highlights on the rankings and correlations indicated are
as follows:

Those who find supervision to be only fair, or poor, attribute
the fault directly to the supervisor.
The 70% who find supervision good or fair, on the other hand,
generally describe a situation which permits them full exercise
of their capabilities, including the availability of an
expert to whom they may turn.
The group grading supervision "fair" seem to lean toward a
poorer assessment, the majority in this group finding super-
vision to be inconsidtent (sometimes meaning untrustworthy
in the sense of being countermanded).

It should be noted further that about 10% of the survey
population was unable to assess supervision, mostly because
they occupied positions characterized as independent assign-
ments.

Table 4

Relation Between Evalutions of the
Division of Work and Responsibility in an jOffice
and the
Organization of an Office Per Its Objectives

| Work and Responsibilities Are Divided | Office Organization Per Objectives | | | | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Well | Reasonably well | Not too well or poorly | Not applicable | |
| Well | 58 | 35 | 9 | --- | 102 |
| Reasonably well | 33 | 81 | 12 | 6 | 132 |
| Poorly | 3 | 13 | 6 | 1 | 23 |
| Not applicable | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 9 |
| TOTAL | 95 | 130 | 28 | 13 | 266 |

NOTE: Marginal figures are the total for each grade for each
function, row total for how responsibilities are divided,
column totals for the way the office is structured or organized.

Internal figures cross index the grades given the two functions,
showing their similarity or dissimilarity, i.e. well for both,
well for one but reasonably well for the other, etc.
Grades which correlate for the two functions are circled,
those which deviate, and thus suggest different causes, are
boxed.

Highlights include the following:
marginal totals give rather
similar overall grading, i.e.
  95 to 102 "well" for each function (about 38%)
 130 to 132 "reasonably well" (about 49%)
  28 to 23   "not too well" or poorly" (about 11%)

However, the internal cross index shows that the same persons
did not always give the same grade to each function;
    56 persons grade both well,·
    81 persons grade both reasonably well, and
    6 persons grade both as poor.
Then,
    68 persons mix their grades, i.e. 33 and 35 respectively
    grade one function well and the other reasonably well, or
    vice versa, the one reasonably well while the other well.
    The total of deviations is increased by another 37 for
    the other mixed grades.

Table 5

Evaluation of Promotion System

System Rated            Comments Made About the System

| System Rated | Favorable | | Unfavorable | | | ROW TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Merit Rewarded | Fared Well Personally | Seniority Over-emphasized | Arbitrary | More needs to be known | |
| **Favorable** | | | | | | |
| Well | 16 | 25 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 46 |
| Reasonably well | 45 | 28 | 9 | 43 | 12 | 137 |
| | | | | | | 183 |
| **Unfavorable** | | | | | | |
| Not very well | 2 | 1 | 2 | 32 | 7 | 44 |
| Poorly | - | - | 2 | 7 | 1 | 10 |
| | | | | | | 54 |
| TOTAL | 117 | | 120 | | | 237 |

NOTE: Marginal figures are the total for each grade given (row) and each comment (column).

Internal figures cross-index the grades with the comments and show the extent to which they coincide. Figures which are circled have a reasonable correlation; those boxed indicate a deviation between the grade and the nature of the comment.

Highlights of the table include the following: whereas 183 (row margin) grade the promotion system favorably only 117 cite favorable aspects in their comments (column margin). Further, the grand total is 237, which means that, some 39 feel too uninformed to make a judgment.

Those who make the same general comment, grade the system differently, for example 16 who say merit is rewarded grade the system "well" but 45 grade it as functioning "reasonably well" in contrast to an even split in the grades between "well" and "reasonably well" for those who say they have fared well.
The 120 who comment on unfavorable aspects of the system, distribute their grades rather evenly between favorable (69) and not (51). Grades and explanations of them deviate in 72 cases, in general, all of which suggests the need for deeper inquiry.

## Table 6

### Evaluation of the Reassignment Process

| Process Rated | Comments Made About the Process | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Favorable | | Unfavorable | | | |
| | Management and Individual interests are Balanced | Individual is well served | Management Dominates the process | Individual Must Maneuver | There is no System | ROW TOTAL |
| **Favorable** | | | | | | |
| Well | 31 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 38 |
| Reasonably well | 34 | 1 | 20 | 7 | 28 | 90 / 128 |
| **Unfavorable** | | | | | | |
| Not very well | - | - | 15 | 6 | 34 | 55 |
| Poorly | - | - | 1 | 6 | 17 | 24 / 79 |
| **TOTAL** | 70 | | 137 | | | 207 |

NOTE: Marginal figures are the total for each grade (row) and each comment (column).

Internal figures cross-index the grades with the comments and show the extent to which they coincide. Figures which are circled indicate a reasonable degree of correlation; those which are boxed indicate a deviation between the grade and nature of the comment.

Highlights of the table include the following: whereas 128 (row total) grade the process favorably, only 70 cite favorable aspects (column total). Put another way, while only 79 grade the process as more or less poor, 137 make unfavorable comments on the way it is handled. Further, 69 were too uninformed to comment.

Grades and comments correlate reasonably well in 149 cases (but still leave room for further inquiry) but 58 cases deviate to a greater extent.

Among those that correlate reasonably well, 79 are favorable with respect to the process and 70 are unfavorable.

Table 7

Positive and Negative Attributes of the
Agency as a Place to Work

| Attributes ranked by % of interviewees citing each | Average Grade for the Agency by Rank of Attribute in each Grade | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total % | 1. Very Good | 2. Excellent | 3. Good |
| 1. Good administration provides job satisfaction | 31.4% | 1 (15.5%) | 2 (9.8%) | 1 (6.1% |
| 2. Opportunity to pursue a professional career in depth | 27.3% | 2 (10.6%) | 1 (13.3%) | 3 (3.4% |
| 3. High quality of personnel | 15.2% | 3 (7.2%) | 3 (6.8%) | 4 (1.5% |
| 4. Importance of Agency mission and role | 12.5% | 4 (4.9%) | 4 (6.4%) | 5 (.8% |
| 5. Poor personnel and management policy or treatment | 11% | 5 (2.7%) | --- | 2 (5.3% |
| 6. Other | 2.7% | | | |

Table 8

Career Service by Length of Service
and Current Grade
by Number and Percentage(1)

| Current Grade | Career Service and Length of Service | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | TOTAL | | Admin | | Opers | | Intel | | S&T | | |
| | 4 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 9 | |
| 7-8 | 17 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 3 | 4 | - | 1 | 1 | 26* |
| % | | 9% | | 13% | | 27% | | 4% | | 2% | |
| 9 | 26 | 16 | 3 | - | 12 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 32 |
| % | | 11% | | 6% | | 33% | | 6% | | 9% | |
| 10-11 | 73 | 12 | 8 | 2 | 10 | - | 29 | 6 | 26 | 4 | 85 |
| % | | 31% | | 21% | | 21% | | 39% | | 35% | |
| 12-13 | 37 | 43 | 7 | 7 | - | 8 | 18 | 19 | 12 | 9 | 81* |
| % | | 30% | | 30% | | 17% | | 41% | | 24% | |
| 14 & up | 18 | 32 | 4 | 10 | - | 1 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 14 | 51* |
| % | | 19% | | 30% | | 2% | | 10% | | 30% | |
| TOTAL | 171 | 101 | 24 | 23 | 32 | 16 | 57 | 33 | 58 | 29 | 275 |
| | 63% | 37% | 50% | 50% | 67% | 33% | 63% | 37% | 67% | 33% | |

(1)Three personnel from the Executive area have been omitted from this Table, except in the totals with asteriks each of which includes one person from the Executive area. The grand total is one short because information on one of the variants was lacking.

Table 9

Career Service by Length of Service
and Number of Promotions(1)
by Number and Percentage

| Number of Promotions | Career Service and Length of Service | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | TOTAL | | Admin | | Opers | | Intel | | S&T | | TOTAL |
| | 4 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 9 | |
| None | 7 | 3 | 2 | - | - | - | 1 | - | 4 | 3 | 10 |
| % | 2.7% | | 4.2% | | -- | | 1% | | 8% | | |
| One | 26 | 11 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 12 | 5 | 37 |
| % | 13.7% | | 14.5% | | 8% | | 10% | | 19.8% | | |
| Two | 60 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 15 | 1 | 16 | 3 | 22 | 2 | 69* |
| % | 25.2% | | 18.8% | | 35% | | 21% | | 28% | | |
| Three | 47 | 11 | 5 | 1 | 10 | 3 | 20 | 4 | 12 | 3 | 58 |
| % | 21.5% | | 12.5% | | 28.5% | | 26.7% | | 17.5% | | |
| Four | 22 | 11 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 34* |
| | 12.3% | | 18.8% | | 9% | | 13.3% | | 9.2% | | |
| Five or more | 6 | 58 | 2 | 13 | - | 9 | 3 | 22 | 1 | 14 | 65* |
| % | 23.7% | | 31.2% | | 19.5% | | 28% | | 17.5% | | |
| TOTAL | 168 | 102 | 24 | 24 | 30 | 16 | 57 | 33 | 57 | 29 | 273 |

(1) Three personnel from the Executive area have been omitted from this Table, except in the totals with asteriks each of which includes one person from the Executive area. The grand total is three short because information on one of the variants was lacking.

APPENDIX B


Population Profile

## Population Profile

In mid to late summer 1974 the IG's Staff interviewed 276

employees to see how they felt about certain aspects of the Agency

and their careers in it.   They constituted 86 percent of an adjusted

population made up of all those assigned to positions in headquarters

who, on the one hand, were classified as having professional status and,

on the other hand, had been with the Agency for four (up to five) or nine

(up to ten) years.   They were selected because they had been with the

Agency long enough to have an informed view but not necessarily

committed to a career; and because resignations among professional

employees cluster to a small extent at these two periods of service.

This selection of those who may not yet have made up their minds about

a career in the Agency also means that there is an omission of those who

are more likely to hold the higher grades and management positions.   The

survey population is, in other respects, a reasonable cross section of the

Agency, representing working level employees.

The DDI and DDS&T each accounted for about 90; the DDA and DDO each had 48. (See Tables 2 and 3 in the appendix for distribution of personnel by length of service, current grade, and number of promotions within each Directorate.)

By length of service, the four year group is the larger being two-thirds of the total (actually 62%). The Directorate for Administration has the only significant variation, dividing equally between the four and the nine year groups.

Grade distribution among the several Directorates varies significantly. The total population breaks roughly into equal parts between those in grades 11 and below, and p2 and above, but the lowest grades (7 and 8) account for only 9% in this division. In this division, there are two substantial divergences among the Directorates. The DDA has 10% fewer in the lower grades while the DDO has 30% more than the average for the whole. Both of these are counterbalanced in the grade 12-and-above groups, where DDA has 10% more and DDO 30% less. When the middle grade group (9-11) is removed and the lowest and higher groups are compared, there are further differences among Directorates. The DDI and the DDS&T have almost none in the lower group and slightly over 50% (close to the distribution for the total population) of their respective groups in the higher. The DDA has 60% in the higher grades (i.e. 12 and up), however, with the DDO having only 19%.

2

## Methodology

A questionnaire was prepared with pre-coded answers for about two-thirds of the questions. The remainder were open-ended and asked for explanations of answers already given. The two types of questions combine to yield more meaning from measurable responses.

The answers to each of the open-ended questions were grouped, to the extent that they could be purposefully classified, and then coded for machine application. This process was handled by two inspectors working independently and the collaborating on the final classification for each question. As the answers were often in narrative fashion rather than adjectival, they required review. To classify this two inspectors considered and agreed upon the assignment of respondents' answers to the categories established for each question.

The questionnaires were administered and filled in by five inspectors in interviews which lasted from one half to over an hour. While explanations and questions were presented according to a generally agreed format, all inspectors were assigned to conduct interviews in all directorates to avoid any unintended bias resulting from one inspectors concentrating in a single directorate.

## Reflections on Methods

The open-ended question demands more work in administering and analyzing interviews, but it has certain inherent advantages over the

structured or pre-coded question. By definition it elicits individual responses, thus permitting self-selectivity and more range than the rigidly structured format. The effect in this study is to qualify the answer or rating given to a structured question in several ways.

One qualification is in the different level of appreciation from which interviewees see situations. The effectiveness of the organization of an office, for example, may be considered by some as simply the absence of handicap in pursuing work, or it may be viewed as an effective meshing of functions. The answer in the first instance could be considered neutral, or even spurious, but in a machine tabulation of simple grades it is given equal weight with the more positive response. We have endeavored to catch these variations and measure them.

A second qualification is in the different dimensions of the appraisals by employees. Most, for example, rate their own offices high on achieving stated objectives. Some however are skeptical about the validity of the ultimate ends to which their work contributes and question whether their own work (objectives) is as effectively directed as might be. The message from this larger dimension of response is that it avails the Agency little to know that personnel believe their office objectives to be well met, if they also believe these are off the mark or of little value. We have sought these evaluation judgments.

Table 10

Personnel in the Survey Sample
by Directorate and Number Interviewed

| Directorate | Total Sample | NOT Interviewed | Interviewed | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Number | Percentage |
| DCI Area | 3 | 0 | 3 | 100% |
| M&S | 53 | 5 | 48 | 90.56% |
| DDO | 61 | 13 | 48 | 78.68% |
| DDI | 98 | 8 | 90 | 91.83% |
| S&T* | 102 | 15 | 87 | 86% |
| Total | 317 | 41 | 276 | 86.75% |

* Figures adjusted down from 133 to 102. 31 personnel from NPIC were
deleted from its total sample population of 61 on a matched basis,
retaining as far as possible the original proportion of personnel with
4 and 9 years service. The total sample population was consequently
reduced from 348 to 317.

A third qualification is the different significance that people attach to various Agency functions. For example, reassignment is a relatively unimportant subject to some, but their responses on this point are given the same weight in a structured question as are the answers of others for whom reassignment is important and who judge the system from their own experience. Importance or meaningfulness is perhaps even more apparent with respect to the Agency's mission. This is significantly important to some -- this is why they work here and the source of their job satisfaction. Others, however, may believe that the Agency's mission is important, but it may be of little direct consequence on their actions or morale. We have sought to clarify the personal -- and perhaps subjective -- views.

We have made this brief methodological explanation, among other reasons, because our intent in the survey is to present a qualitative analysis of the attitudes of personnel toward Agency performance and their careers. While there is a mathematical base, we are primarily interested in comparing open-ended answers with specific evaluations to get the feel of officers toward the Agency and their careers. While this lacks the precise statistical calculation of standard deviations possible with questionnaries structured to measure degrees, it takes

into consideration observations which arise out of open-ended questions

and that are sometimes more important of themselves than the number

who commented. The apparent evaluations of even substantial majorities,

may be reduced in their significance when consideration is given the forces

which bear upon those evaluations. We have sought to catch some of these

qualities in the attitudes of personnel interviewed for this survey.

APPENDIX C

Questions

Individual Interviews were classified SECRET (when filled in)

but when the results were consolidated in the attached form in

a general Summary they lost the classification and are marked

for handling as ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY.

Interview No. _____

Headquarters Interview Program

Professional Personnel
with four and nine years
of service

Background Variables

| 1. Current Grade | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Seven-eight | 26 | 9% |
| 2. Nine | 31 | 11% |
| 3. Ten-eleven | 85 | 31% |
| 4. Twelve-thirteen | 81 | 30% |
| 5. Fourteen and over | 51 | 19% |
| | 274 | |

| 2. Number of Promotions *EOD Grade | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. None | 10 | 4% |
| 2. One | 37 | 14% |
| 3. Two | 68 | 25% |
| 4. Three | 58 | 21% |
| 5. Four | 34 | 12% |
| 6. Five or more | 65 | 24% |
| | 272 | |

| 3. Career Service | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Exec. | 3 | 1% |
| 2. M | 48 | 17.5% |
| 3. D | 48 | 17.5% |
| 4. I | 90 | 33% |
| 5. R | 86 | 31% |

| 4. Age | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. 25 or under | 15 | 5.4% |
| 2. 26-29 | 74 | 27% |
| 3. 30-34 | 98 | 36% |
| 4. 35-39 | 46 | 17% |
| 5. 40-44 | 21 | 7.6% |
| 6. 45 or over | 20 | 7% |

| 5. Sex | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Male | 208 | 77% |
| 2. Female | 63 | 23% |

| 6. Time-In Grade | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. One or less | 189 | 69% |
| 2. Two-Three years | 52 | 19% |
| 3. Four-Five years | 25 | 9% |
| 4. Six years or more | 9 | 3% |
| | 275 | |

| 7. Length of Service | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Four years | 171 | 62% |
| 2. Nine years | 105 | 38% |
| | 276 | |

| *8. Other Government Service | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. None | 139 | 51% |
| 2. One-Two years | 45 | 17% |
| 3. Three-Five yrs. | 64 | 23% |
| 4. Six-Eight yrs. | 12 | 4% |
| 5. Nine or more | 13 | 5% |
| | 273 | |

| *9. Number of transfers to significantly different offices or jobs | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. None | 138 | 50% |
| 2. One-Two | 111 | 41% |
| 3. Three-Four | 21 | 8% |
| 4. Five or more | 3 | 1% |
| | 273 | |

| *10. What led you to seek employment with the Agency? | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Recruiter | 105 | 39% |
| 2. Advertisement | 20 | 8% |
| 3. Friend | 44 | 16% |
| 4. Self initiative | 100 | 37% |
| | 269 | |

*Questions in this section will be
taken from the data on hand.
Asterisked questions must be asked
of interviewee.

E 2 IMPDET CL BY _____

STAT

*11. What was your motivation in
    taking a job here?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Absorbing job | 69 | 26% |
| 2. | Agency mission | 51 | 19% |
| 3. | Government career | 43 | 16% |
| 4. | Good career generally | 49 | 18% |
| 5. | A job | 47 | 18% |
| 6. | Other | 7 | 3% |
| | | 266 | |

12. Organizational Office

DCI Area
1. O/DCI
2. Comp
3. IG
4. ICS
5. NIO
6. OLC
7. OGC

Management & Services
8. Med
9. Commo
10. Log
11. Pers
12. Security
13. OTR
14. Fin
15. OJCS
16. CTP

Operations
17. Staffs
    OS, PS, CCS, SS
18. AF
19. EUR
20. EA
21. NE
22. SB
23. WH

Intelligence
27. OBGI
28. OCI
29. CRS
30. FBIS
31. OER
32. IA
33. OSR
34. OPR
35. DDI
36. UCS
37. OPCS

Science & Technology
38. O/S&T
39. OEL
40. ORD
41. OSA
42. OSI
43. OWI
44. ODE
45. OTS
46. NPIC

STAT

* Questions in this section
will be Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP76-00593R000100120001-6
on hand. Asterisked questions
must be asked of interviewee

## Personnel Management System

13. Generally speaking, do you feel your abilities are used in your present job?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Fully | 100 | 36% |
| 2. | Generally | 134 | 49% |
| 3. | Somewhat | 27 | 10% |
| 4. | Little | 11 | 4% |
| 5. | N.A. | 2 | 1% |
| | | 274 | |

14. If the answer to Question No. 13 is negative ("somewhat" or "little") can you explain the reason.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Job does not require | 14 | 38% |
| 2. | Job too narrowly designated | 10 | 28% |
| 3. | Poor management | 11 | 31% |
| 4. | Other | 1 | 3% |
| | | 36 | |

15. Have you advanced as rapidly as you think you should?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Yes | 176 | 64% |
| 2. | No | 79 | 29% |
| 3. | Unsure | 18 | 7% |
| 4. | N.A. | 1 | |
| | | 274 | |

16. If the answer to Question No. 15 is "No", how do you explain it?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Restrictive Agency Policy | 6 | 7% |
| 2. | Restrictive Management practice | 46 | 57% |
| 3. | Poor grade structure | 7 | 9% |
| 4. | Discrimination | 16 | 20% |
| 5. | Other | 6 | 7% |
| | | 81 | |

17. What do you think of the training offered you by the Agency? Explain why you feel this way. [Coded under No. 18 below.]

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Generally useful | 202 | 74% |
| 2. | Little or no use | 31 | 11% |
| 3. | N.A. | 40 | 15% |

18.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Insight to Agency and career | 21 | 10% |
| 2. | Job related | 101 | 45% |
| 3. | Good course available | 49 | 22% |
| 4. | Some poor administration | 32 | 14% |
| 5. | | 6 | 3% |
| 6. | Orientation only/ introduction | 14 | 6% |
| | | 223 | |

19. If you have had rather substantial training in the Agency, is the skill you acquired being used in your present job?

1. Fully      60    22%
2. Generally 73    27%
3. Somewhat 18    6%
4. Little      21    8%
5. N.A.      100    37%
                272

20. How do you feel about the way the promotion system works? Explain why you think this is so. [Coded under No. 21 below.]

1. Very well          47    19%
2. Reasonably well 141    56%
3. Not very well    46    18%
4. Poorly          10    4%
5. N.A.            9    3%
                253

21.
1. Fair; rewards merit       63    24%
2. Good personal experience   54    21%
3. Seniority/time-in-grade over 14    5%
    emphasized
4. Arbitrary             90    35%
5. More needs to be known    38    15%
                259

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

22. What is your opinion about the way re-assignments are made? What makes you think so? [Coded under No. 23 below.]

1. System works well 39    16%
2. Reasonably well    93    38%
3. Not very well      54    22%
4. Poorly          24    10%
5. N.A.           34    14%
                244

23.
1. Management and individual   65    30%
    need, balanced
2. Management predominates    38    18%
3. Individual fully served      5    2%
4. Individual must initiate/     24    11%
    maneuver
5. No pattern; so system      83    39%
                215

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

24. Do you feel that people with similar backgrounds and jobs should be in the same career service, regardless of the Directorate in which they work?

1. Yes      85    33%
2. No     106    41%
3. Unsure   67    26%
          258

25. Do you believe you have the opportunity to take the initiative to find other jobs?

1. Yes    220    83%
2. No     43    16%
       264

26. What do you think of the possibility of crossing Directorate boundaries?

1. Very possible    28    11%
2. Possible    112    46%
3. Seldom possible    97    39%
4. Impossible    10    4%

27. Have you discussed your future career with any officer? (If answer is No, skip to Question No. 33 below). If N.A. skip to Question No. 37 below).

1. Yes    204    74%
2. No.    67    24%
3. N.A.    4    2%
       275

28. If answer to Question No. 27 is "Yes" what was the officer's position?

1. Supervisor    107    55%
2. Senior Officer    52    26%
3. Office's Staff O.    31    16%
4. M&S Officer    4    2%
5. Other    2    1%
       196

29. What brought about the discussion?

1. Self initiated    84    43%
2. Routine R.Q.    41    21%
3. FR discussion    27    14%
4. Personnel off.    3    2%
5. Other    39    20%
       195

30. What did you talk about?

1. Evaluation of performance    5    3%
2. Possible advancement    13    7%
3. Training needs    5    2%
4. Possible assignments    38    20%
5. Possible directions    21    11%
6. Overall discussion    109    56%
7. Other    3    1%
       194

31. Was the discussion satisfactory? Why?
    [Coded under No. 32 below]

    1. Yes    164    81%
    2. No.     26    13%
    3. Other   13    06%
                    203

32. 1. Got concrete results; what    28  14%
          he wanted
    2. Responsive, encouraging       113  58%
          exchange
    3. Within limits of situation     21  11%
          o.k. - but
    4. Too general or negative        22  11%
    5. Other                          11   6%

    1.
    2.
    3.
    4.
    5.
    6.

33. (If the answer to Wuestion 27 above was
    "No"). Have you felt the need to discuss
    your future career with an officer? (If
    answer is "No" skip to No. 36).

    1. Yes    35    53%
    2. No.    31    47%
               66

34. If the answer to Question No. 33 above
    is "Yes" explain why you have not done
    so.

    1. Did not try         1    3%
    2. Did not know        5   14%
          where to go
    3. Useless:            1    3%
          personal cause
    4. Useless:           11   30%
          the management
          officer
    5. Useless: the        5   14%
          system
    6. Other              13
                          36

35. If the answer to Question No. 33
    above is "Yes" what would you
    like to discuss about your future?

    1. Evaluation of       0    0
          performance
    2. Possible            2    6%
          advancement
    3. Training needs      1    3%
    4. Possible            1    3%
          assignments
    5. Possible           16   49%
          directions
    6. Overall            11   33%
          discussion
    7. Other               2    6%
                          33

36. If you have not felt the need to discuss your future, why is this the case?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | System works well | 5 | 16% |
| 2. | Manage by myself | 10 | 32% |
| 3. | No purpose to be served | 12 | 39% |
| 4. | Other | 4 | 13% |
| | | 31 | |

Administration

37. What is the best source from which you normally learn things of concern to you about the Agency and its policies? (i.e., Agency activities, personnel policies).

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Staff meeting | 80 | 41% |
| 2. | Memos | 51 | 26% |
| 3. | Bulletin Boards | 1 | 1% |
| 4. | Assemblies | 1 | 1% |
| 5. | Grapevine | 45 | 23% |
| 6. | Other | 15 | 8% |
| | | 193 | |

38. Do you feel the information you thus obtain is adequate?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Yes | 210 | 78% |
| 2. | No. | 58 | 22% |
| | | 268 | |

39. If the answer to Question No. 38 above is "No" why do you feel this is the situation?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Grapevine unreliable | 4 | 7% |
| 2. | Formal Ch'l: filtered out | 15 | 27% |
| 3. | Too sketchy/ untimely | 13 | 24% |
| 4. | Need more on Agency policies and activities | 23 | 42% |
| | | 55 | |

40. How do you feel about the administrative information made available to you in your office to carry on your job (i.e., where to go for information, coordination, approvals, decisions)?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Good | 172 | 63% |
| 2. | Fair | 75 | 27% |
| 3. | Poor | 18 | 7% |
| 4. | N.A. | 9 | 3% |
| | | 274 | |

41. If the answer to Question No. 40 above is negative (i.e., "poor") how do you explain the situation?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Poor Management:none/ filtered out | 15 | 71% |
| 2. | Rapid Turnover personnel | 2 | 10% |
| 3. | Lateral commo difficult | 3 | 14% |
| 4. | Other | 1 | 5% |

| 42. What do you think about the Letter of Instruction? [Coded under No. 43 below] | 1. Very helpful | 28 | 10% |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2. Helpful | 56 | 20% |
| | 3. Somewhat helpful | 63 | 23% |
| | 4. Not helpful | 68 | 25% |
| | 5. Unsure | 16 | 6% |
| | 6. N. A. | 43 | 16% |
| | | 274 | |

| 43. | 1. Sound concept | 85 | 32% |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2. Good selectively only | 21 | 8% |
| | 3. Good concept but impractical | 116 | 44% |
| | 4. Do not have an LOI | 44 | 16% |
| | | 266 | |

| 44. What do you feel about how the work and responsibilities are divided in your office? | 1. Well done | 106 | 39% |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2. Reasonably done | 133 | 49% |
| | 3. Poorly done | 24 | 9% |
| | 4. N. A. | 9 | 3% |
| | | 272 | |

| 45. If the answer to Question No. 44 above is negative ("poorly") explain the situation. | 1. Poor structure | 12 | 50% |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2. Poor supervisors | 9 | 38% |
| | 3. Other | 3 | 12% |
| | | 24 | |

| 46. How do you feel about the requirements for your job? | 1. Appropriate | 216 | 81% |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2. Inappropriate | 37 | 14% |
| | 3. N. A. | 13 | 5% |
| | | 266 | |

| 47. If the answer to No. 46 above is "inappropriate" can you explain why? | 1. Degree unnec'y | 11 | 30% |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2. Person feels over qualified | 15 | 41% |
| | 3. Person fails to meet qual'ns | 6 | 16% |
| | 4. Other | 5 | 13% |
| | | 37 | |

48. How do you feel about the supervision you receive? Why? [Coded in No. 49 below]

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Good | 191 | 71% |
| 2. | Fair | 46 | 17% |
| 3. | Poor | ‾22 | 8% |
| 4. | N.A. | 10 | 4% |
| | | 269 | |

49. The Supervisor is good respected

Free rein is given

Effective working relations/ established

Not well balanced supervision

The Supervisor is poorly or not trained

Other

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | 42 | 16% |
| 2. | 69 | 27% |
| 3. | 83 | 32% |
| 4. | 33 | 13% |
| 5. | 12 | 5% |
| 6. | 18 | 7% |
| | 257 | |

50. With respect to the objectives of your office, what do you think of the way that office is organized?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Well | 95 | 35% |
| 2. | Reasonably well | 130 | 49% |
| 3. | Not too well | 21 | 8% |
| 4. | Poorly | 9 | 3% |
| 5. | N.A. | 13 | 5% |
| | | 268 | |

51. Do you have any opportunity to influence the way your office is organized?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | A great deal | 29 | 11% |
| 2. | Moderate | 98 | 36% |
| 3. | Rather little | 60 | 22% |
| 4. | None | 68 | 25% |
| 5. | N.A. | 17 | 6% |
| | | 272 | |

52. To what extent do you feel your office is achieving its objectives?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Well | 130 | 49% |
| 2. | Reasonably well | 122 | 46% |
| 3. | Not too well | 10 | 4% |
| 4. | Poorly | 3 | 1% |
| | | 265 | |

53. If answer to Question No. 52 above is negative ("not too well" or "poorly") how do you explain the weakness in achieving objectives?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Poor management | 6 | 50% |
| 2. | Inadequate objectives | 6 | 50% |
| | | 12 | |

54. In balance, how would you judge your office and Directorate in contrast to others known to you?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Better | 107 | 57% |
| 2. | About equal | 65 | 34% |
| 3. | Not as good | 17 | 9% |
| | | 189 | |

General Attitudes

55. How would you describe the general atmosphere in which you work?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Pleasant | 211 | 77% |
| 2. | Tolerable | 49 | 18% |
| 3. | Unpleasant | 10 | 4% |
| 4. | Abrasive | 2 | 1% |
| 5. | N. A. | 1 | 0 |
| | | 273 | |

56. How would you describe the mental tone (approach to the work) in your office?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Vigorous | 98 | 36% |
| 2. | Alert | 124 | 46% |
| 3. | Casual | 30 | 11% |
| 4. | Lethargic | 7 | 3% |
| 5. | Other | 8 | 3% |
| 6. | N.A. | 2 | 1% |
| | | 269 | |

57. If the answer to Question No. 56 above is negative (i.e., casual or lethargic), can you explain the cause?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Uninspiring work | 9 | 25% |
| 2. | Mgnt related difficulties | 14 | 39% |
| 3. | Personnel mentality | 13 | 36% |
| | | 36 | |

58. Do you feel you can have a satisfying career in the Agency?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Very satisfying | 134 | 51% |
| 2. | Generally satisfying | 108 | 41% |
| 3. | Somewhat satisfying | 11 | 4% |
| 4. | Not very satisfying | 11 | 4% |
| | | 264 | |

59. How do you feel in general about the Agency as a place to work? Why? [Coded under No. 60 below]

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Excellent | 97 | 51% |
| 2. | Very good | 115 | 42% |
| 3. | Good | 52 | 19% |
| 4. | Fair | 8 | 3% |
| 5. | Poor | 1 | 0 |
| | | 265 | |

60. Important role/mission
Opportunity for real prof. career in field
High quality of personnel
Good admin. gives job satisfaction
Critical re personal treatment/ admin policy-management
Other

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | 33 | 12% |
| 2. | 72 | 27% |
| 3. | 40 | 15% |
| 4. | 84 | 32% |
| 5. | 29 | 11% |
| 6. | 7 | 3% |
| | 265 | |

61. What is your attitude about remaining with the Agency?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Intend to stay | 214 | 81% |
| 2. | Uncertain | 43 | 16% |
| 3. | Intend to leave | 6 | 2% |
| 4. | N. A. | 2 | 1% |
| | | 265 | |

62. If you intend to stay with the Agency, what are your hopes and aspirations for your future here?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Advance in grade and position | 189 | 74% |
| 2. | Advance in position | 21 | 8% |
| 3. | Advance in grade | 9 | 4% |
| 4. | Status quo | 11 | 4% |
| 5. | Other | 14 | 5% |
| 6. | N. A. | 12 | 5% |

Interview No. _____ p. 12

| 63. How do you think the morale is in the Agency? [Coded in Question No. 64 below] | 1. Very good | 20 | 8% |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2. Good | 133 | 52% |
| | 3. Fair | 82 | 32% |
| | 4. Poor | 16 | 6% |
| | 5. Other | 6 | 2% |
| | | 257 | |

64. How do you account for the state of morale?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Attractive work and working environment | | 101 | 39% |
| 2. Management upswing after Schlesinger era | | 41 | 16% |
| 3. Current problems, and cont'g | | 59 | 23% |
| 4. Dissat'n with personnel treatment-management | | 42 | 16% |
| 5. Other | | 14 | 6% |
| | | 257 | |